

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-20 have been amended to improve clarity. Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM OBJECTION:

In the Office Action, at page 2, claim 20 is objected to for the reasons set forth therein. The claim has been amended to improve clarity. It is respectfully requested that the objection to claim 20 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:

In the Office Action, at page 2, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein.

In response, claim 1 has been amended to improve clarity and antecedent support, and thereby in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of the claims be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 1-2, 9, 3-8, and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,608 to Shabbir M. Dahod ("Dahod"). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Dahod generally describes a Web-based buyer-driven system for efficiently and inexpensively connecting buyers and sellers. See FIG. 1 and columns 3 and 4. Buyers post on the Web site descriptions of products and services they desire, typically along with some personal information such as demographic information that might serve to qualify them to potential sellers. Interested sellers of those products and services can, for a small fee, communicate with buyers they have selected. The system allows buyers to find qualified sellers with little effort and at no cost, and it allows sellers to easily find qualified buyers without using costly mass marketing.

However, Dahod fails to teach or suggest that the Web-based buyer-driven system, searches "for one of the plurality of service sites based on information indicating a location of a user from the member information stored in the member information database and provides a

search result to the user via a service site accessed by the user,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 7. The cited reference is silent as to teaching or suggesting that “member information of said member information database in said center site is updated by and shared with other service sites accessible through said center site,” as recited in independent claim 8. Rather, Dahod merely provides a screen shot of a sample Web page form 230 on which information can be entered, as shown in FIG. 6.

In addition, rather than teaching or suggesting, “providing information suitable for a service type,” as recited in independent claim 11, Dahod allows sellers to look for potential buyers in selected categories and geographic locations or perform a text search of all listings. See column 6, lines 30-34. Dahod does not teach or suggest that the information to sellers is provided “suitable for a service type by changing a search region for each service type,” as recited in independent claim 11.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that claims 1-2, 9, 3-8, and 10-11 be allowed.

In the Office Action, at page 6, claims 12-13, 14, 17, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,718 to Andrew Fano (“Fano”). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Fano generally describes an agent base system that, upon a user arriving at a mall, begins by suggesting the **closest store that sells** at least one item of a type entered by the user during goal specification. See column 47, lines 48-56. Along with the store name a system in accordance with a preferred embodiment prepares a list of the specific items available and their prices. A map of the mall displays both the precise location of the store and the shopper's current location. The shopper queries the system to suggest a store at any time based on their current location.

However, rather than teaching or suggesting “searching shops based on the service region, so that information related to one shop is not retrieved in said searching when the registered service region of the one shop is out of a search region,” as recited in independent claim 12, Fano searches for shops that sells at least one item of a type entered by the user. Fano does not search based on a service region “so that information related to one shop is not retrieved in said searching when the registered service region of the one shop is out of a search region,” as recited in independent claim 12. Similarly, Fano does not teach or suggest, “creating a searching expression based on each specific institution around a current location of a user;

and providing information corresponding to the specific institutions around a current location of the user based on the searching expression created," as recited in independent claim 13.

Although Fano describes providing personalization of information based not only on a static user profile, but also by taking into account history of the user interactions and current real-time situation including "who, where, and when" awareness, Fano does not teach or suggest, "providing information suitable for a move history of a user by changing a search condition based on the move history," as recited in independent claim 17. See column 40, lines 4-7. Nothing in the cited reference provides providing information suitable for a move history and, based on the move history, changing a search condition.

In addition, Fano fails to teach or suggest, "a web site system comprising a center site and service sites accessible through said center site, where the center site comprises a member information database, said member information database comprising... a registering part registering said single region to said member information database," as recited in independent claim 19. Rather, a system is provided configured for a mall containing stores. See column 47, lines 20-26.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that claims 12-13, 14, 17, and 19-20 be allowed.

In the Office Action, at page 8, claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,424,912 to John J. Correia ("Correia"). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Correia generally provides a database consisting of latitude/longitude coordinates may be searched for the locations of the destination, all street intersections within a proximity region of the destination. See FIG. 4 and corresponding text. A vehicle's location may be determined through the use of a global positioning system or other type of system.

However, Correia is silent as to teaching or suggesting, "a method for searching information and conducted by one of service sites in a web site system including a center site and said service sites accessible through said center site," as recited in independent claims 15 and 16. Rather, the cited reference generally provides a method for providing vehicle navigation instructions to a destination from its current location. See FIG. 4 and corresponding text.

Correia is silent as to teaching or suggesting that the method to search information and conducted by one of service sites in a web site system includes "providing information suitable

for a moving direction of a user by changing a search condition based on the moving direction ,” as recited in independent claim 15 or “providing information suitable for a moved distance of a user by changing a search condition based on the moved distance,” as recited in independent claim 16.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that claims 15 and 16 be allowed.

In the Office Action, at page 8, claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,839 to Yasuhiro Monde (“Monde”). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Monde generally provides a navigation system searches for a route from the present position to a destination with considering weather information and regulation information collected by an information collecting section (2) and vehicle information input from an operating section (3). See FIG. 1 and corresponding text. However, Monde fails to teach or suggest, “a method for searching information, said method conducted by one of service sites in a web site system including a center site and said service sties accessible through said center site, the method.

Monde is silent as to teaching or suggesting that the method to search information and conducted by one of service sites in a web site system includes “providing information suitable for a weather condition of a user by changing a search condition based on the weather condition,” as recited in independent claim 18.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that independent claim 18 be allowed.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 04/19/2007

By: Alicia Choi
Alicia M. Choi
Registration No. 46,621

700 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500